DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 887 EA 026 677

AUTHOR Washburn, David E.
TITLE Multicultural Education Policy in the United States: A Social Foundations Analysis.
PUB DATE 95
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Acculturation; *Cultural Pluralism; Diversity (Institutional); *Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Ethnocentrism; *Multicultural Education; Politics of Education; Power Structure; Social Integration; Social Structure; Socioeconomic Influences

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a reconceptualization of multicultural education for the 21st century through a critical analysis of the current status of multicultural education. Based on Milton M. Gordon's theory of racial and ethnic group relations and assimilation, the paper identifies three ideological systems for viewing assimilation--"anglo-conformity," "the melting pot," and "cultural pluralism." It describes in detail the following types of multicultural educational policies--anglo-conformist, culturally pluralistic, liberally pluralistic, and corporately pluralistic. An anglo-conformist approach upholds the status quo, has absolutist standards, and attempts to assimilate the multicultural masses into the mainstream. A culturally pluralistic approach is relativistic; it accepts the many worlds of human reality. The formation of educational policy depends on political power, and the current power structure favors the anglo-conformist perspective. However, the paper argues that the social reality is structural pluralism along "ethclass" lines with some acculturation occurring along the margins (Milton M. Gordon defines the "ethclass" as "the intersection of the vertical stratifications of ethnicity with the horizontal stratifications of social class"). It advocates the practice of democratic citizenship to create national unity. Because the institution of education alone is not equipped to reconstruct the social order, the United States must commit itself to a social compact among its major institutions. It should move toward a liberally pluralistic multicultural approach with a core of democratic studies, which includes culturally sensitive early intervention, school desegregation across ethclass lines, an equitable funding formula, teacher training, and ties to economic equity in the public economic sector. Contains 34 footnotes. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 887

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES:

A SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS ANALYSIS

by David E. Washburn

Department of Curriculum and Foundations
Bloomsburg University of Pennsylvania
Bloomsburg, PA 17815
(717) 389-4276

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Washburn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 026 677

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

© 1995, David E. Washburn

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES: A SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS ANALYSIS

Introduction

A review of educational literature will indicate that the term "culture" does not begin to appear with any regularity until 1962,[1] following Oscar Lewis' juxtapositioning of the term with "poverty".[2] The notion of a "culture of poverty" began to inform educational thinking on this topic. Unfortunately, with the best of intentions (the amelioration of deficits produced by "poor" backgrounds), the concept most closely associated with culture in the literature of the period was that of deprivation. Therefore, what one finds is a burgeoning literature of "cultural deprivation" during the mid-1960's. This was unfortunate because those groups most devastated by poverty, in terms of the percentages of their total populations, were the minority cultures. Although there were (and are) more white people living in poverty than any other group, the designation "culturally deprived" came to be associated with minority group status in the popular mind.

It is apparent from reviewing the literature of "cultural deprivation" that the assimilationist mentality prevailed in education. These children exhibited differences in terms of values attitudes, behaviors, and language and learning styles from those expected and rewarded in schools which institutionalized Anglo-

Saxon, middle-class, mainstream culture. The problem was initially perceived as how to change the children, not how to change the schools.

During this period the movement for Civil Rights was gaining momentum. Its impact on education began with studies which uncovered the Anglo-Saxon, middle-class bias which existed in school curricula, materials and practices.[3] These materials and the values which generated them became a focal point for concern by organized minority groups. The concept of "cultural deprivation" also chafed. Although many could see that their children were at a disadvantage in a school which institutionalized a culture different from their own, they did not see their children, African-American, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Asian-American, Native-American, and others as having been denied a rich cultural heritage.

A movement began for including those historically excluded American heritages in school curricula along with the Anglo-Saxon heritage which had for so long prevailed. The political and social pressure applied by these groups helped change the face of American education and educational materials. Schools, in increasing numbers, developed administrative, instructional, and curricular

strategies aimed at reflecting the culturally pluralistic nature of the country. And, many national, state, and local organizations supported multicultural education.[4]

In 1974 a survey I conducted of the 715 public school districts in the United States which served student populations of ten thousand or more revealed the extent to which various kinds of multicultural education were being practiced at that time.[5] Three hundred ninety-seven (397) school districts (55.5%) reported practices designed to produce multi-ethnic understanding. This 1974 study also showed that fully 81.7% of the ethnic studies curricula had been established since 1969. Only twelve districts (4.2%) indicated having had a program of ten or more years duration.[6]

As an expression of the confidence I had in the notion that multicultural education would burgeon in the years ahead, in an article published in 1979 I wrote,

> Perhaps a measure of the success of the movement toward multicultural education during the 1970's may be found in the fact that a backlash movement is developing against it. Articles are beginning to appear in respected educational journals which question the validity of multicultural education and rumblings of discontent with the 1979 National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education Standards are emanating from colleges of teacher education.
>
> The ensuing debate, which no doubt will occur in the last years of the decade, may galvanize the disparate voices favoring a culturally pluralistic

> orientation for the schools. It should force the development of a fully articulated theory of multicultural education which is now lacking. It should lead to the development of increasing numbers of multidisciplinary-multiethnic curricula encompassing all ethnic groups and all grade levels. And, it should make the 1980's an exciting period for those involved in multicultural education, perhaps ultimately leading to a realization of a new American Dream.[7]

However, during the 1980's those who dreamed of a democratic, egalitarian, pluralistic transformation of the United States through progressive, reconstructionist, multicultural education were confronted with the essentialist, assimilationist, anglo-conformist nightmare characterized as reform in the A Nation At Risk report and promulgated by William Bennet, Allan Bloom, and many others. The backlash I wrote of became educational policy during the Reagan-Bush years.

The backlash and culture clash continues, but, the demographic realities are that Los Angeles and San Antonio now have "minority majorities" -- populations of African-Americans, Hispanic-Americans, and Asian-Americans, which when combined, outnumber the white population. Other cities will soon follow. By the next century members of minority groups will be the majority of the overall United States population.[8] As a result of the realization of this fact by policy makers as well as a growing body of scholarship, attention to the issue by publishers, and other

factors, multicultural education is having a resurgence in the 1990's.

In an effort to reconceptualize multicultural education for the twenty-first century, I am attempting to descriptively analyze and critically evaluate multicultural education as it presently stands. I am struck by the fact that, to my knowledge at least, no national descriptive studies of multicultural education policy and practice have been conducted since my mid-1970's surveys of the 715 largest school districts in the United States, all of the public school districts and private schools in Pennsylvania, and all institutions of higher education in the country.[9] So, a descriptive analysis and critical evaluation of contemporary multicultural education is, necessarily, an analysis and evaluation of *conceptions* of multicultural education which have appeared in the literature on the topic. My working hypothesis is that much education that is multicultural can be found in urban areas whereas, the suburban and rural practice of this orientation is problematic.

Sleeter and Grant[10] have provided a useful typology of conceptions of multicultural education breaking schooling down to business as usual and five approaches to multicultural education: teaching the exceptional and culturally different, human relations, single group studies, multicultural education, and education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist. Since their

analysis has been influential in providing a framework for investigation of multicultural education and many in the field are familiar with their typology, I will refer to it in my own analysis while offering a somewhat different orientation.

The theoretical framework I am adopting for this task was developed by Milton M. Gordon[11], not for analyzing multicultural education per se, but rather as a general theory of racial and ethnic group relations and assimilation. Among the constructs he developed or adapted that I believe are especially useful here include the three ideological systems for viewing assimilation, "anglo-conformity," the "melting pot," and "cultural pluralism."

> ...the "anglo-conformity" theory demanded the complete renunciation of the immigrant's ancestral culture in favor of the behavior and values of the Anglo-Saxon core group; the "melting pot" idea envisaged a biological merger of the Anglo-Saxon peoples with other immigrant groups and a blending of their respective cultures into a new indigenous American type; and "cultural pluralism" postulated the preservation of the communal life and significant portions of the culture of the later immigrant groups within the context of American citizenship and political and economic integration to American society.[12]

Gordon also invented the construct *ethclass*. He said,

> I propose...that we refer to the subsociety created by the intersection of the vertical stratifications of ethnicity with the horizontal stratifications of social class as the *ethclass*. Thus a person's *ethclass* might be upper-middle class white, Protestant, or lower middle class white Irish Catholic,, or upper-lower class Negro

> Protestant, and so on...differences of social class are more important and decisive than differences of ethnic group.[13]

Gordon felt that the major key to the understanding of the ethnic makeup of American society was *structural pluralism.* That is, we are a society largely segregated along ethclass lines, with the dominant factor in terms of behaviors, attitudes and values being social class. Ethnicity is the subordinate though still influential variable. He wrote,"...structural assimilation in substantial fashion has not taken place in America."[14]

Gordon, further, postulated four types of societies with regard to ethnic orientation: racist, assimilationist, liberal pluralist, and corporate pluralist. The latter two terms will be defined in the text of the analysis.

Anglo-Conformist Educational Policy

The anglo-conformist orientation retains an ascendant position in many school districts and university campuses. Sleeter and Grant's "business as usual and "teaching the exceptional and culturally different" approaches to schooling are anglo-conformist positions. The current debate over so called "political correctness" and/or "multiculturalism" in academe which has been reported in such media as Newsweek, The New Republic, The New York Times, and The Chronicle of Higher Education of late is a case in

point. An hour and a half broadcast on National Public Television was devoted to this issue in 1991[15] and others have followed. Essentially the argument of the anti-"political correctness" forces is that a left-wing fascism has taken hold on many campuses in the United States which undermines academic freedom and the free flow of ideas. Professors and students as well, the argument goes, come under microscopic scrutiny and vicious attack if any fringe political, social, religious, life-style or other group conjure up a notion that a sexist, racist, ethnically, behaviorally, or otherwise offensive written statement, remark, joke, innuendo, facial expression, or body language has been directed their way. It is claimed that as "political correctness" has become a semi-official doctrine on these campuses the academic careers of offending parties are jeopardized and full discussion of alternatives to semi-official policy is restricted or eliminated. Such stalwart defenders of academic freedom as former President George Bush, Boston University's President John Silber[16], The University of Chicago's Allan Bloom[17], the University of Virginia's E. D. Hirsch, Jr.[18], former Secretary of Education and Director of Drug Control Policy William Bennet[19], former Director of The National Endowment for the Humanities Lynn Cheney[20], Dinesh D'Souza[21], and others are all concerned about this move toward "political correctness".

The curricular dimension of "political correctness", from the point of view of these forces, is a plethora of courses and teaching methodologies which pander to fringe groups and a watering down of the content of mainstream courses. They believe that there is a common core of subject matter which should touch the minds of all students in schools, colleges, and universities, irrespective of sex, ethnic heritage, or social class. Also, there are transcendent truths, great thoughts, great literature, and a line of thinking which bind us together as a nation with a common culture. However, academic standards are undermined and a nation is at risk as a result of this movement toward "political correctness". The curricula of schools, colleges, and universities give short shrift to the great books and great works of MANkind, to the ideas and values which have stood the test of time, to the thinkers and leaders in all walks of life who have helped shape the very foundation upon which our national culture rests. Additionally, teachers who are not fully grounded in this traditional subject matter use undemanding methodologies lacking in the rigor to fully develop the rational capacities of students.

This threat to the natural order has been met with an anglo-conformist reform agenda. The A Nation At Risk Report and America 2000 are cases in point. They advocate a core curriculum of basic subjects for all students which are intrinsically superior for

developing intellectual discipline and through which the values and modes of thinking and behaving of the American core culture are transmitted. They want a longer school day and year, and more homework, so that additional time may be spent on inculcating these truths as well as ratiocination. They feel that teacher training should emphasize specialization in these core subject matters and deemphasize teaching methodologies. They push for a national standardized testing program to measure student progress in these subject matter areas, assess teacher and school accountability, and provide data for comparing our students with those of other countries. They stress the mastery of the basic disciplines through systematic, organized presentation or information, memorization, recitation, and teacher led discussions. It is suggested that these reforms will help us in developing disciplined, intelligent, culturally literate, civilized individuals who share our national values and will work hard to maintain our premier positions in the global economy and military preparedness.

Correlated to these educational policies are contemporary social policy suggestions which call for the restriction of immigration from third world countries until those already here have a greater period of time to assimilate into the American

mainstream culture and policies making English the official national language.

Cultural Pluralism

Even if immigration and language restrictions are put in place, the present demographic shifts to a minority-majority places the anglo-conformist position in jeopardy in spite of it being the power elites' policy formulation of choice. Instead, ever since 1915, when Horace M. Kallen[22] began calling for a culturally pluralistic interpretation of the United States in which different groups maintained their cultural identities while having mechanisms for easy interaction with one another and equal opportunity of access to the institutions of the society, as well as equal opportunities for participation in the formation of the values which regulate the society, voices have been raised favoring an educational orientation which reflects that interpretation. In 1916 John Dewey called for a study of America's various heritages in the public schools.[23] The "intercultural education" movement of the 1940's and 1950's attempted to reconcile the right of diverse groups to maintain their identities with the responsibilities of democratic citizenship by affording individuals the option of being "ethnic" or not as they might see fit.[24] The Civil Rights Movement

of the 1960's gave further impetus to the idea of education that was multicultural.

Liberally Pluralistic Educational Policy

Two educational policy positions emanating from a culturally pluralistic interpretation of American ideals and realities have emerged in the 1990's. The first owes some allegiance to the aforementioned "intercultural education" movement and can best be termed "liberally pluralistic"[25]. Milton Gordon defines "liberal pluralism" as

> the absence, even prohibition, of any legal or governmental recognition of racial, religious, language, or national origins...and a prohibition of the use of ethnic criteria of any type for discriminatory purposes, or conversely for special or favored treatment...Equalitarian norms in such a society would emphasize equality of opportunity and evaluation of individuals on the basis of universalistic standards of performance. Structural pluralism...would exist voluntarily...as would cultural pluralism, at the will of the ethnic group members.[26]

The goals of a liberally pluralistic multicultural education are panhumanistic, metacultural and liberating.[27] Aspects of the conceptions designated as "human relations," "multicultural education," and "education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist," may be subsumed by this construct. However some of the "feel good" aspects of the "human relations" approach

can be used for assimilation purposes by the anglo-conformists. By coming to grips with his or her ethnicity and the ethnicity of others and gaining the conceptual wherewithal for critical, reflective, open, flexible, sharable inquiry into the contexts through which humans interpret their worlds, the learner escapes ethnic encapsulation. The person is, thereby, equipped for citizenship in a complex, rapidly changing, socio-economically stratified and structurally pluralistic, multicultural, multiracial society characterized by a multiplicity of segmented value orientations but which, at least nominally, espouses democracy as its way of life. Through an integrated and multidisciplinary, multicultural curriculum touching all subject matters and all grade levels alternative cultural contexts for reality and value formation and knowledge construction are explored and problems confronted. In this way problem solving ability and commitments to open and ongoing inquiry into and reconstruction of values are cultivated. An amendable system of judgment is developed which tests proposed solutions to problems, and ideas in general, on the basis of their probable consequences for human social growth, welfare, and development in a multicultural society and world. The curriculum is inquiry rather than subject matter centered. All areas of investigations are approached through a multicultural prism. The contributions, sensitivities, and analytic contexts of

the diverse groups which make up our society and world are taken into account and the frames of reference of a variety of subject matters (their models, methods, and theorems) are utilized in the conduct of the inquiry. The teacher in this type of multicultural education is much more than a subject matter specialist. He or she is a co-inquirer who, taking into account and accommodating to differences in student learning and language styles, values, attitudes, and beliefs, serves as facilitator, arranger of experiences, and research project director.[28] The ideal setting for this kind of inquiry involves a school desegregated across ethclass lines which is truly multicultural and socioeconomically heterogeneous. Issues of concern to students from different ethclass groups could, thereby, be more easily shared in heterogeneously grouped classes and alternative cultural contexts explored in collaborative problem solving. The cultural orientations, learning, and language styles of the various ethclass groups would be respected. For example, both Western and non-Western world views and the learning styles of diverse and traditional students can be accommodated.[29]

In order to facilitate cross-cultural communication, understanding, and collaborative problem solving, a liberally pluralistic education would include programs of bilingual and bidialectal education. Standard English would be taught to

speakers of non-standard English and languages other than English in such a way that the home language was neither denigrated nor replaced. Languages and dialects other than standard English would be taught to the English speakers as well. Liberal pluralists claim that, while respecting diversity, this approach prepares students for full participation in a society which espouses democratic, egalitarian, pluralistic ideals.

Educational materials which reflect the cultural diversity of the nation and world, their histories, literatures, religions, myths, legends, and conceptual orientations would get full play in a liberally pluralistic education.

Other practices favored by the liberal pluralists include cooperative learning, whole language approaches, human relations training for teachers, community involvement in school policy decisions, inservice teacher training in multicultural education, student involvement in curriculum planning and other policy decisions, and an interracial student council.

Corporately Pluralistic Educational Policy

There is a second multicultural education policy formulation which also views the United States as a culturally pluralistic society, but which favors a "corporately pluralistic" orientation toward ethnicity. Milton Gordon writes that "corporate pluralism" refers to a social situation in which

> racial and ethnic groups are formally recognized as legally constituted entities with official standing in the society. Economic and political rewards...are allocated on the basis of numerical quotas...Equalitarian emphasis is on equality of condition rather than equality of opportunity...cultural pluralism tends to be reinforced...structural pluralism is officially encouraged.[30]

Corporate pluralists see the issues of culture and ethnicity primarily in terms of power imbalances where dominant groups exploit and oppress subordinate groups. They favor a multicultural education which sensitizes majority group children to cultures different from their own and engages children of subordinate groups in critical analyses of their own condition. The students are, thereby, conceptually equipped with the means of resisting the oppression of the dominant group. Empowerment of subordinate groups to overcome the tyranny of the majority is a major focus of the corporate pluralists. The ultimate goal of a corporately pluralistic multicultural education is to create a new world order in which formerly oppressed groups are in control of their own destinies. Multicultural and global education are inextricably bound because injustice and oppression are global phenomena. The school must expose inequities and play a pivotal role in righting the social imbalances that produce gaps between rich and poor groups and nations, racial, religious, and gender discrimination,

and other invidious social distinctions.[31] The social activist aspects of Sleeter and Grant's designation "education that is multicultural and social reconstructionist" can be seen here.

Those advocating "single-group studies" sometimes take this a step beyond the social reconstructionists by advocating that it is important for minority ethnic groups to maintain their cultural traditions, their languages, and group solidarity. From this point of view multicultural education means cultural maintenance through a curriculum composed of courses on specific ethnic groups taught by ethnic group members. Ethnic minority members are taught by role models who share their ethnic experience.

These teachers serve as educational statespersons and social activists who engage students in critical inquiry into social problems affecting their groups and in devising strategies for planned change in contemporary society. Students examine the national and world situation through the prism of their group's ethnic experience. Afrocentric, Hispanocentric, and other ethnocentric points of view serve the purposes of providing students with pride in their own heritages and mechanisms for critical analyses of the national culture. In this way vehicles for penetrating the national power structure may be developed. Students are encouraged to question the status quo, investigate

controversial issues, to develop alternatives, and to work in society to put these alternatives into practice.

The recent attempts by Spencer Holland, Director of the Center for the Education of African-American Males at Morgan State University, and others to institute African-American Male Academies in Baltimore and Detroit in which African-American male children are taught by African-American male teachers are illustrations of this approach, although advocates for the separate classes and schools for African-American males are concerned as much with sheer survival in American culture as they are with cultural maintenance.[32]

Critical Evaluation

In most countries on this globe a small number of people control the life fates of the majority. It does not necessarily follow that simply because the United States will become a minority majority country during the twenty-first century that these groups will be shaping social policy at that time. But these projected changes do appear to have attracted the attention of today's power elite. Many of the anglo-conformist, assimilationist, essentialist educational policies articulated in A Nation At Risk and America 2000 reports have been promulgated from the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton White Houses through the statehouses to schools. This

could be perceived as cynical attempts to maintain the status quo by further tranquilizing the minds of young citizens and, thereby, producing a mass society who respond behaviorally with even greater enthusiasm to the crass propagandization of a narrowly focused power elite.

On the other hand, they may really believe their own propaganda having been imbued with a conceptual orientation which places them at the authoritative center of a natural order (set by the invisible hand of a white male god, no doubt) in which values (Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Teutonic values at that) are absolute and eternal, where it is their role to see that natural law should prevail unimpeded, and transcendent truths are transmitted to the uninitiated.

This latter possibility is the more disquieting for true believers can be much more dangerous with their backs to the wall than cynics. And, those advocating the culturally pluralistic orientations for the schools have it within their grasp to put myopic ethnocentrism to a very stern test.

The liberally pluralistic progressivist and the corporately pluralistic reconstructionist positions are more complex, their advocates speaking with disparate voices, their power less concentrated than the anglo-conformists, however. Those favoring a culturally pluralistic interpretation of United States national

culture appear to share a number of premises which place them at odds with the anglo-conformists. Rather than a fixed exogenous reality independent from human intelligence they grasp an anthropic cosmological interpretation which holds that human intelligence is essential not only to the nature of the universe but to its very existence. Pluralism rests on a "many worlds" theory of reality in which the conceptualization of human groups is central. No matter what the universe may be in and of itself its meaning is relative to the conceptualization of humans. In like manner human groups create and test rules for living. These rules are contextual. Different groups create different rules which are tested in different cultural contexts. Knowledge and truth are contextual phenomena as well. One group's truth can be another group's myth. The relativism of cultural pluralism is in sharp contrast to the absolutistic notions of anglo-conformity.

Ultimately which interpretation will be realized in social and educational policy formulation and implementation is more a matter of political power and national will than clarity of vision, however. People who tend to get their policies put into place are presently favoring an anglo-conformist approach, but the grass roots are increasingly multicultural. The role of policy becomes assimilation of the multicultural masses, through education and other means, into the anglo-conformist mainstream. However, the

social reality is structural pluralism along ethclass lines with some acculturation and assimilation at the various margins.

The liberal pluralist notion of educational policy directed to the production of a human community sensitive to the many cultural contexts for meaning creation seems to fit well with democratic, egalitarian, pluralist ideals. The power imbalances highlighted by the corporate pluralists, however, point to the implausibility of realizing these ideals until playing fields are leveled. Until then the powerful anglo-conformists can, in the guise of liberal pluralism, continue to utilize the networks of power to get their way. Globally, dwindling resources appear to demand collaborative efforts across cultures if humankind is to survive and prosper while rigid and often archaic political and economic structures combined with ethnocentrism stand in the way.

Ethnocentrisms die hard deaths if they die at all. After seventy years communism in the former Soviet Union was unable to eradicate them. Educational policies designed to eradicate cultural identities are not likely to be successful either. Anglocentrism must come to be seen as a context for creating reality juxtaposed with other such contexts. Anglos can be proud of their heritage and lionize many aspects of it while at the same time recognizing the contributions made by other groups in the development of the United States. For example, we can be proud of

a long Anglo-Saxon tradition of democracy while being sensitive to and equally proud of the contributions of the Iroquois Confederacy to the unique principles upon which our own nation was built.

Speculative Analysis

But do we have a cultural mortar which, in spite of our heterogeneity, binds us as a nation? What does cultural literacy mean in the midst of diversity? Cultural literacy in our own complex society should not be ethnocentric; it should be metacultural. We can find our national cultural mortar in the mortar of democratic citizenship. All individuals and all groups are invited to participate responsibly in the democratic process. But, it is romantic to think that the social order can be reconstructed through the school alone. The institution of education is not equipped for this task and, if the research reported by Bennet and Lecompte is correct the average teacher is a politically conservative "...white, married, woman in her mid-thirties with two children...from a middle to upper-middle class family...likely to teach in a suburban elementary school...comfortable in her rather traditional gender role."[33] This is not the profile of the "educational statesperson" and social activist that reconstructionist George S. Counts envisaged the ideal teacher to be.[34] If we ever are to realize the democratic,

egalitarian, pluralistic ideals we nominally espouse and say we cherish, the United States must commit itself to a social compact among its major institutions including education.

This social compact must include a commitment to equity involving the public and private sectors of our nation alike. As we progress toward this ideal a liberally pluralistic multicultural education with a core of democratic studies becomes a focal point of policy reformulation. Democratic studies involve a knowledge base as well as practice in the utilization of democratic methodologies. This culturally sensitive education would begin early in the lives of the children of our nation. Early intervention programs such as The Perry Pre-School Project of Ypsilante, Michigan have been shown to have long lasting beneficial effects, but have been criticized in some quarters for being culturally genocidal. Culturally sensitive early intervention educational programs involving a national system of publicly and privately funded day care would be an important element in a social compact for equity. Desegregation of schools across ethclass lines, heterogeneously grouped classes, and the elimination of tracking and culturally punitive uses of testing would be other elements. Liberally pluralistic multicultural education must be combined with an equitable funding formula for public schools which eliminates the impact of the uneven distribution of wealth in the

nation on the quality of education delivered to children of different ethclasses. A revamping of teacher education to the end of adequately preparing a population of teachers equipped to work in an educational system committed to inclusion and multiculturalism, designed to conceptually prepare students for active and responsible participation in a democratic society is critical.

These educational policies would be inextricably tied to the development of collaborative economic models on a global basis, a national commitment for equity which would involve workfare and job training and retraining involving public schools, governmental agencies, and the private sector. Job creation should be a part of this process as well as a more progressively oriented income tax structure and other reforms.

These reforms would help us realize the ideals of liberal pluralism while remedying the injustices articulated by corporate pluralists. Are we as a nation likely to engage ourselves in such an endeavor? The power elite, in their shortsightedness probably would not see it in their self-interest to do so. Therefore, we, the combined peoples of the United States, committed to the democratic ideals on which this nation was founded (and will stand) must have the perspicacity and political will to carry it off.

Footnotes

1. see David E. Washburn, Democracy and the Education of the Disadvantaged: A Pragmatic Inquiry (Portland, Oregon: Lewis and Clark College, 1971).

2. Oscar Lewis, The Children of Sanchez: Autobiography of a Mexican Family (New York: Random House, 1961).

3. Washburn (1971) op. cit.

4. David E. Washburn, "Multicultural Education: Origins, Development and Prospects," *Research Bulletin*, Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University 23, 1 (May 1979): 33-39.

5. David E. Washburn, "Multicultural Education in The United States," *Phi Delta KAPPAN* 56,9 (May 1975): 636.

6. David E. Washburn, "Ethnic Studies in The United States," *Educational Leadership* 32,6 (March 1975): 404-412.

7. Washburn, op. cit., 1979.

8. Chris Raymond, "Global Migration Will Have Widespread Impact on,Society, Scholars Say," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (September 12, 1990): A-1, 6.

9. see Washburn (March 1975) (May 1975), op. cit., as well as David E. Washburn, "Where to Find Ethnic Studies Materials," *Social Education* 39, 1 (January 1975): 40-41. "The Pennsylvania Ethnic Heritage Studies Survey," *Pennsylvania Ethnic Studies Newsletter*, 3,1 (September 1977): 3-7. "Multiethnic Education in Pennsylvania," *Phi Delta KAPPAN* 59, 8 (April 1978): 561. *Ethnic Studies in Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Center for International Studies, 1978). *Directory of Ethnic Studies in Pennsylvania* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Center for International Studies, 1978). *Ethnic Studies, Bilingual/Bicultural Education and Multicultural Teacher Education in the United States: A Directory of Higher Education Programs and Personnel* (Miami: Inquiry International, 1979). *Multicultural Education Programs, Ethnic Studies Curricula, and Ethnic Studies Materials in the United States Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1980). *Bilingual/Bicultural Education in the United States: Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1981). *Multicultural Teacher Education in the United States* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center

Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1981). *Ethnic Studies in the United States: Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1981). "Cultural Pluralism: Are Teachers Prepared?" *Phi Delta KAPPAN* 63,7 (March 1982): 493-495. "Ethnic Studies in the United States: Higher Education," *CORE: An International Journal of Educational Research*, Carfax publishing Company, Oxford, England 6,3 (1982): Fiche 15 G8.

10. Sleeter, Christine E., and Grant, Carl A., *Making Choices for Multicultural Education: Five Approaches to Race, Class, and Gender* (Columbus: Merril Publishing Company, 1988).

11. see Milton M. Gordon, *Assimilation in American Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964). *Human Nature, Class, and Ethnicity* (New York: Oxford university Press, 1978).

12. Gordon (1964) op. cit. 85.

13. Gordon (1964) op. cit. 51-53.

14. Gordon (1964) op. cit. 111.

15. *Public Broadcasting System*, "Firing Line Special Debate -- Resolved: Freedom of Thought is in Danger on American Campuses," produced by Warren Steibel in association with South Carolina Instructional Television (September 6, 1991).

16. John Silber, *Straight Shooting: What's Wrong With America and How to Fix It* (New York: Harper and Row, 1989).

17. Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987).

18. E. D. Hirsch, Jr., *Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1987). *The Dictionary of Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1988). *A First Dictionary of Cultural Literacy* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989).

19. William J. Bennet, *Our Children and Our Country: Improving America's Schools and Affirming the Common Culture* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988).

20. Lynn V. Cheney, *American Memory: A Report on the Humanities in the Nation's Public Schools* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1987). *Tyrannical Machines: A Report on Educational Practices Gone Wrong and Our Best Hopes for Setting Them Straight* (Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Humanities, 1990).

21. Dinesh D'Souza, *Illiberal Education: The Policies of Race and Sex on Campus* (New York: The Free Press, 1991).

22. Horace M. Kallen, *Culture and Democracy in The United States* (New York: Boni and Liveright, 1924. Reprint Edition 1970 by Arno Press, Inc.).

23. John Dewey, "Nationalizing Education," *Addresses and Proceedings of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Meeting* (National Education Association of The United States, 1916): 185-186.

24. See:
William E. Vickery and Stewart G. Cole, *Intercultural Education in American Schools* (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1943).

Stewart Cole and Mildred Wiese Cole, *Minorities and the American Promise* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954).

25. Hundreds of articles and many books have been written from this point of view. See David E. Washburn, *Multicultural Education: A Chronological Bibliography of Selected Materials*, (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1981).

26. Milton M. Gordon, op. cit., 1978, 87-89.

27. David E. Washburn, "A Conceptual Framework for Multicultural Education," *The Florida FL Reporter* 10 (Spring/Fall 1972): 27-28.

28. David E. Washburn, op. cit.

29. see, James A. Anderson, "Cognitive Styles and Multicultural Populations," *Journal of Teacher Education* 39,1 (January-February 1988): 2-9. "Reaching Beyond Monoculturalism: Acknowledging the Demands of Diversity," *SAEOPP Journal* 8,2 (1989).

30. Gordon, op. cit., 1978.

31. For example, see:
J. Cummins, "Empowering Minority Students: A Framework For Intervention," *Harvard Educational Review* 56 (Spring 1986): 18-36.

H. Giroux, *Theory and Resistance In Education: A Pedagogy For the Opposition*, (South Hadley, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey, 1983). "Critical Pedagogy, Cultural Politics and the Discourse of Experience," *Journal of Education*, 167,1 (1985): 22-41. "Literacy and the Pedagogy of Voice and Political Empowerment," *Educational Theory* 38 (1988): 61-75.

C. McCarthy, "Race and Education in The United States: The Multicultural Solution," *Interchange* 21 (1990): 45-55. *Race and Curriculum: Social Inequality and the Theories and Politics of Difference in Contemporary Research on Schooling* (London: The Falmer Press, 1990).

P. McLaren, *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education* (New York: Longman, 1989).

M. Olneck, "The Recurring Dream: Symbolism and Ideology in Intercultural and Multicultural Education" *American Journal of Education* 98,2 (1989): 147-174.

M. Sarup, *The Politics of Multiracial Education* (New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1986).

Christine E. Sleeter, *Empowerment Through Multicultural Education* (Albany: State University of New York Press,, 1991).

32. See:
"A School for Black Males: Is It An Answer for Baltimore?" *The Abell Report* 2,5 (January/February 1991): 1-4.

C. R. Gibbs, "Project 2000: Why Black Men Should Teach Black Boys," *Dollars and Sense* (February/March 1991): 19-27.

Spencer Holland, et. al., *Project 2000*, Center For Educating African-American Males, Morgan State University's School of Education and Urban Studies (1990).

William Oliver, "Black Males and Social Problems: Prevention Through Afrocentric Socialization," *Journal of Black Studies* 19 (September 1989): 15-39.

33. Kathleen P. Bennet and Margaret D. Lecompte, *How Schools Work: A Sociological Analysis of Education* (New York: Longman, 1990): 129-130.

34. George S. Counts, *The Social Foundations of Education* (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1934).